

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-16 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 2 is cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter related therein. Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 10 and 16 are amended. No new matter is added.

I. Personal Interview

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Broadhead during the November 2, 2004 personal interview. Applicants separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

II. Drawings

Figs. 2, 3 and 4 are objected to for not being legible. Clear and legible figures were submitted and that the illegibility of the figures appears to be the result of scanning the drawings at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. Replacement copies of Figs. 2, 3 and 4, which have not been altered or amended in any way are provided. Figs. 2, 3 and 4, as submitted, are legible. Accordingly, Applicants request the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,913,912 to Nishimura et al. ("Nishimura"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Nishimura fails to disclose each and every feature recited in the rejected claims. For example, Nishimura fails to disclose an airport operations managing system that provides decision support for airport operations, comprising a first database networked with a first data source usable to obtain and store publicly available status information on the status of airport operations, a second database networked with a second data source usable to obtain and store non-proprietary airline status information of airline activities, wherein the second database is

networked with the first database for status information exchange, and a first airport operations advisor module having at least one of a graphical user interface and a text based interface and usable to manage airport operations, wherein the first airport operations advisor is networked with at least the first database to receive at least one of the publicly available status information and the non-proprietary airline status information, wherein the at least one of the publicly available status information and the non-proprietary airline status information is accessible by airport management and an airline, as recited in claim 1.

Nishimura also fails to disclose an airport operations managing system that provides decision support for airport operations, comprising a first data source that provides publicly available airport status information, wherein the first data source is connected to an input/output interface, a second data source that provides non-proprietary airline status information, wherein the second data source is connected to an input/output interface, a memory connected to the input/output interface via a databus for storing status information, a display connected to the input/output interface for viewing status information from the at least one of the first and the second data source by airport management and an airline, an input device connected to the input/output interface for inputting user commands to the airport operations managing system based on the status information, and a controller connected to the input/output interface to control the movement of data within the airport operations managing system, as recited in claim 7.

Additionally, Nishimura fails to disclose the method of providing decision support for airport operations, as recited in claim 10, or a storage medium storing a set of program instructions executable on a data processing device and usable to provide decision support for airport operations, as recited in claim 16.

As discussed during the interview, Nishimura only discloses that which is known in the art and suffers from the problem being addressed in this application as identified in the

Description of Related Art section of the application. In fact, Applicants identify Nishimura as one of many existing techniques for displaying aircraft location data for analysis and decision support which use various database configurations and display methods to support the decisions required to manage the movement of aircraft (page 1, paragraph [0004] of the application).

Nishimura discloses a management method and system for rationalizing management of moving of aircraft at an airport. The management system links respective information systems, such as crisis management functions, spot allocation functions, gate allocation functions, etc. to allow an operator to easily ascertain the condition of all aircraft in an airport so aircraft management functions can be performed in an optimal way. The management system consists of a plurality of information processing devices and a flight strips management device (cards that give movement information, such as take-off and landing times for each aircraft) connected to the plurality of information devices. The flight information processing devices 10a-10f process information, such as aircraft condition information and/or gate allocation information for each aircraft, control information of the airfield, service information relating to servicing of the aircraft, spot management information, i.e., take-off/landing spot, allocation for take-off/landing of aircraft on a runway, gate allocation and check-in/booking system information. The flight strips management device 20 compiles flight strips information representing movement information of each aircraft based on the read management information from the plurality of information processing devices, and stores the compiled flight strips information. An information reading unit 21 reads flight strips information from the storage unit 23. An information display 24 displays flight strips information on a screen showing aircraft position information and aircraft condition information on an overall view of the airport.

The Office Action alleges that the control information database 12 corresponds to the first database recited in the rejected claims. The control information database 12 is provided in the control information processing device (computer) 10b and stores management information controls, such as flight name, aircraft information such as type of aircraft, or origin, destination, transit airports, schedules, scheduled time, actual time, condition information, allocated spot (scheduled and actual), allocated runway (scheduled and actual), etc., (col. 5, lines 19-27). The control information database 12 is one of several databases 11-16 used in the flight strips management system that are connected to the flight strips management device 20.

The Office Action further alleges that the flight information database 11 corresponds to the second database as recited in the rejected claims. The flight information database 11 is provided in the flight information processing device (computer) 10a and stores management information such as flight name, point of origin, destination, transit airports, aircraft schedule, scheduled landing and takeoff times, actual times when takeoff and landing are completes, aircraft condition information and allocated gate (col. 5, lines 9-18).

During the interview, it was determined that the Examiner alleges that the control information processing device (computer) 10b, in which the control information database 12 is provided, corresponds to the first airport operations advisor module as recited in the rejected claims. Thus, according to the interpretation, the control information processing device (computer) 10b is networked with at least the control information database 12 alleged to correspond to the first database. However, as the control database 12 resides in the computer 10b, Applicants submit that the alleged airport operations advisor module 10b is not networked with the alleged first database 12. Rather, the database 12 is resident in the computer 10b.

Additionally, there is no disclosure in Nishimura that the control information database 12 receives at least one of publicly available status information and non-proprietary airline status information, wherein the at least one of the publicly available status information and the non-proprietary airline status information is accessible by airport management and an airline. Rather, according to Nishimura the computer 10b, including the resident database 12, is connected only to a flight strips management device 20. The flight strips management device is constituted of an information reading unit 21, flight strips compiling an updating unit 22, storage unit 23, information display unit 24 and information input unit 25 (col. 4, lines 32-25). The information display unit 24 displays on a screen, aircraft position information and aircraft condition information on an overall view of the airport (col. 4, lines 52-54). Thus, Nishimura does not disclose the airport operations management system as recited in the rejected claims. Rather, Nishimura only discloses gathering and displaying aircraft position information and aircraft condition information on an overall view of the airport. There is no disclosure in Nishimura of gathering the information described in the claims and having such information accessible by airport management and an airline.

Regarding claim 3, there is no disclosure in Nishimura of the control information database including airline status information of functions that are proprietary to an airline.

Regarding claim 6, there is no disclosure in Nishimura of a third airport operations advisor module located at an external agency. The Office Action alleges that Nishimura discloses a third airport operations advisor module identified by reference numbers 24 and 25. However, reference numbers 24 and 25 correspond to an information display unit and an information input unit (screen and keyboard, respectively) that are part of the flight strips management device 20. Thus, Nishimura does not disclose a third airport operations advisor module located at an external agency.

Regarding the rejection of claims 7-16, Applicants submit that these claims are allowable for their recitation of similar features as discussed above.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1 and 3-16 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

John W. Fitzpatrick
Registration No. 41,018

JAO:JWF/ldg

Attachments:
Replacement Sheets

Date: November 9, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
